



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,977	11/25/2003	Alan Packer	MS#305871.01 (5090)	6925
321 7590 03/17/2008 SENNIGER POWERS LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102				
EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N				
ART UNIT 2154		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/17/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/721,977

Applicant(s)

PACKER ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh N. Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :2/29/08, 11/14/07, 10/18/07, 06/15/07, 04/28/06, 1/10/06, 09/28/05, 12/27/04, 12/13/04, 11/25/03.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are subject to examination.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The present title is too broad and is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

Drawings

3. The figures submitted on 11/25/03 are acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. An initialed and dated copy of the applicant's IDS form 1449 (s) are attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities:

“adapted to” should be replaced with a gerund in order to make the limitation more positive for examination. Appropriate correction is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 2154

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 16, 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. The claim 16 does not fall into any of the statutory categories. Please claim computer storage medium such as memory, etc., that is hardware medium/media.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Packer 2005/0050222 (Hereinafter Packer).

9. Referring to claim 1, Packer discloses a method for detecting an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an unsafe behavior (e.g., page 3), comprising: analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 3); categorizing the electronic

communication as relating to the unsafe behavior as a function of the analyzed features (e.g., page 3); generating a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said report indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); and sending the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., page 4).

10. Referring to claim 2, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses specifying a type of the unsafe behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 5).

11. Referring to claim 3, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein said type of the unsafe behavior includes one or more of the following: sexual predatory behavior, bullying behavior, offensive language, personal information solicitation or revelation, personal characteristics solicitation or revelation, meeting arrangement with a stranger, picture sharing with a stranger, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 4).

12. Referring to claim 4, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication further comprises: parsing the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., page 3); generating, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the unsafe behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); and applying the generated feature vector

to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the unsafe behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication (e.g., page 4), wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the unsafe behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features (e.g., page 4), said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); and wherein said categorizing the electronic communication comprises categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., page 4).

13. Referring to claim 5, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior if the rating is greater than a threshold level (e.g., page 5).

14. Referring to claim 6, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the probabilistic classifier comprises one or more classifiers selected from a group comprising: a Naive Bayesian classifier, a limited dependence Bayesian classifier, a Bayesian network classifier, a decision tree, a support vector machine, a content matching classifier, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 6).

15. Referring to claim 7, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein parsing the electronic communication comprises one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing

the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., page 3).

16. Referring to claim 8, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses updating one or more of the following: the probabilistic classifier or the predefined set of one or more features (e.g., page 4).

17. Referring to claim 9, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the report is further sent to the user (e.g., page 3).

18. Referring to claim 10, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

19. Referring to claim 11, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the report comprises one or more of the following: a content of the electronic communication, an identification of a source or recipient of the electronic communication, a time of the electronic communication, a type of the unsafe behavior related to the electronic communication, and a recommendation of how to address said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4).

20. Referring to claim 12, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses indicating that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., page 3).

21. Referring to claim 13, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses generating an alert if the electronic / communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said alert informing that the electronic communication relates to the unsafe behavior to one or more of the following: the user or the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

22. Referring to claim 14, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein said alert is generated only if the electronic communication is still in progress (e.g., page 5).

23. Referring to claim 15, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the electronic communication comprises one or more electronic messages selected from a group comprising: an email, an instant messaging session, or a chat session (e.g., page 3).

24. Referring to claim 16, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses one or more computer readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (e.g., page 3).

25. Referring to claim 17, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses a system adapted to detect an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an undesired behavior (e.g., page 3), comprising: a computer to receive or send the electronic communication; computer-executable instructions to analyze one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 3); computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication as either relating to the undesired behavior or relating to an innocuous behavior as a function of the analyzed features (e.g., page 3); computer-executable instructions to generate a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the undesired behavior, said report indicative of the undesired behavior; and computer-executable instructions to send the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., page 4).

26. Referring to claim 18, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses computer-executable instructions to specify a type of the undesired behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 4).

27. Referring to claim 19, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein said type of the undesired behavior includes one or more of the following: sexual predatory behavior, bullying behavior, offensive language, personal information solicitation or revelation, personal characteristics solicitation or revelation, meeting arrangement with a stranger, picture sharing with a stranger, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 4).

28. Referring to claim 20, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the computer-executable instructions to analyze one or more features of the electronic communication further comprise computer-executable instructions to: parse the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., page 3); generate, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the undesired behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., page 3); and apply the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the undesired behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication (e.g., page 4), wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the undesired behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features, said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 4); and wherein said computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication comprises computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication as either relating to the type of the undesired behavior or relating to the innocuous behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., page 5).

29. Referring to claim 21, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the type of the undesired behavior if the rating is greater than a threshold level (e.g., page 5).

30. Referring to claim 22, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the probabilistic classifier comprises one or more classifiers selected from a group comprising: a Naive Bayesian classifier, a limited dependence Bayesian classifier, a Bayesian network classifier, a decision tree, a support vector machine, a content matching classifier, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 4).

31. Referring to claim 23, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the computer-executable instructions to parse the electronic communication comprise computer-executable instructions to perform one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., page 5).

32. Referring to claim 24, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses computer-executable instructions to update one or more of the following: the probabilistic classifier or the predefined set of one or more features (e.g., page 4).

33. Referring to claim 25, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the report is further sent to the user (e.g., page 3).

34. Referring to claim 26, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses computer-executable instructions not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

35. Referring to claim 27, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the report comprises one or more of the following: a content of the electronic communication, an identification of a source or recipient of the electronic communication, a time of the electronic communication, a type of the undesired behavior related to the electronic communication, and a recommendation of how to address said type of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 5).

36. Referring to claim 28, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses computer-executable instructions to indicate that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., page 4).

37. Referring to claim 29, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses computer-executable instructions to generate an alert if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the undesired behavior, said alert adapted to inform that the electronic communication relates to the undesired behavior to one or more of the following: the user or the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

38. Referring to claim 30, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein said alert is generated only if the electronic communication is still in progress (e.g., page 5).

39. Referring to claim 31, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the electronic communication comprises one or more electronic messages selected from a group comprising: an email, an instant messaging session, or a chat session (e.g., page 3).

40. Referring to claim 32, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein said computer is a server or a client (e.g., page 3).

41. Referring to claim 33, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein said computer is a client and said computer- executable instructions to analyze the electronic communication are located on a server, and wherein the server is adapted to receive the electronic communication sent or received by the client for said computer-executable instructions located on the server to analyze the electronic communication (e.g., page 4).

42. Referring to claim 34, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for

performing a method to detect an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4), said method comprising: analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the unsafe behavior as a function of the analyzed features; generating a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said report indicative of the unsafe behavior; and sending the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., page 5).

43. Referring to claim 35, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses specifying a type of the unsafe behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4).

44. Referring to claim 36, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein said analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication comprises: parsing the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., page 3); generating, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the unsafe behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); and applying the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the unsafe behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication, wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the unsafe behavior to identify said predefined set of one or

more features, said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); and wherein said categorizing the electronic communication comprises categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., page 4).

45. Referring to claim 37, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein parsing the electronic communication comprises one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., page 5).

46. Referring to claim 38, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the method further comprises not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

47. Referring to claim 39, Packer discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Packer also discloses wherein the method further comprises indicating that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., page 3).

48. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pather et al., 2007/0156656 (Hereinafter Pather).

49. Referring to claim 1, Pather discloses a method for detecting an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4), comprising: analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the unsafe behavior as a function of the analyzed features (e.g., page 4); generating a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said report indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); and sending the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., page 4).

50. Referring to claim 2, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses specifying a type of the unsafe behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 5).

51. Referring to claim 3, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein said type of the unsafe behavior includes one or more of the following: sexual predatory behavior, bullying behavior, offensive language, personal information solicitation or revelation, personal characteristics solicitation or revelation, meeting arrangement with a stranger, picture sharing with a stranger, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 4).

52. Referring to claim 4, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication further comprises: parsing the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); generating, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the unsafe behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); and applying the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the unsafe behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication (e.g., page 4), wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the unsafe behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features (e.g., page 4), said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); and wherein said categorizing the electronic communication comprises categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., page 4).

53. Referring to claim 5, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior if the rating is greater than a threshold level (e.g., page 5).

54. Referring to claim 6, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the probabilistic classifier comprises one or more classifiers selected from a group comprising: a Naive Bayesian classifier, a limited dependence Bayesian classifier, a

Bayesian network classifier, a decision tree, a support vector machine, a content matching classifier, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 6).

55. Referring to claim 7, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein parsing the electronic communication comprises one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., page 4).

56. Referring to claim 8, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses updating one or more of the following: the probabilistic classifier or the predefined set of one or more features (e.g., page 4).

57. Referring to claim 9, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the report is further sent to the user (e.g., page 4).

58. Referring to claim 10, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

59. Referring to claim 11, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the report comprises one or more of the following: a content of the electronic communication, an identification of a source or recipient of the electronic communication, a time of the electronic communication, a type of the unsafe behavior related to the electronic communication, and a recommendation of how to address said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4).

60. Referring to claim 12, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses indicating that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., page 4).

61. Referring to claim 13, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses generating an alert if the electronic / communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said alert informing that the electronic communication relates to the unsafe behavior to one or more of the following: the user or the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

62. Referring to claim 14, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein said alert is generated only if the electronic communication is still in progress (e.g., page 5).

63. Referring to claim 15, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the electronic communication comprises one or more electronic messages

selected from a group comprising: an email, an instant messaging session, or a chat session (e.g., page 4).

64. Referring to claim 16, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses one or more computer readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (e.g., page 4).

65. Referring to claim 17, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses a system adapted to detect an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an undesired behavior (e.g., page 4), comprising: a computer to receive or send the electronic communication; computer-executable instructions to analyze one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 4); computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication as either relating to the undesired behavior or relating to an innocuous behavior as a function of the analyzed features (e.g., page 4); computer-executable instructions to generate a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the undesired behavior, said report indicative of the undesired behavior; and computer-executable instructions to send the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., page 4).

66. Referring to claim 18, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses computer-executable instructions to specify a type of the undesired behavior to

detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 4).

67. Referring to claim 19, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein said type of the undesired behavior includes one or more of the following: sexual predatory behavior, bullying behavior, offensive language, personal information solicitation or revelation, personal characteristics solicitation or revelation, meeting arrangement with a stranger, picture sharing with a stranger, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 4).

68. Referring to claim 20, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the computer-executable instructions to analyze one or more features of the electronic communication further comprise computer-executable instructions to: parse the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); generate, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the undesired behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); and apply the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the undesired behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication (e.g., page 4), wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the undesired behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features, said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 4); and wherein said

computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication comprises computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication as either relating to the type of the undesired behavior or relating to the innocuous behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., page 5).

69. Referring to claim 21, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the type of the undesired behavior if the rating is greater than a threshold level (e.g., page 5).

70. Referring to claim 22, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the probabilistic classifier comprises one or more classifiers selected from a group comprising: a Naive Bayesian classifier, a limited dependence Bayesian classifier, a Bayesian network classifier, a decision tree, a support vector machine, a content matching classifier, or a combination thereof (e.g., page 4).

71. Referring to claim 23, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the computer-executable instructions to parse the electronic communication comprise computer-executable instructions to perform one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., page 5).

72. Referring to claim 24, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses computer-executable instructions to update one or more of the following: the probabilistic classifier or the predefined set of one or more features (e.g., page 4).

73. Referring to claim 25, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the report is further sent to the user (e.g., page 4).

74. Referring to claim 26, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses computer-executable instructions not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

75. Referring to claim 27, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the report comprises one or more of the following: a content of the electronic communication, an identification of a source or recipient of the electronic communication, a time of the electronic communication, a type of the undesired behavior related to the electronic communication, and a recommendation of how to address said type of the undesired behavior (e.g., page 5).

76. Referring to claim 28, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses computer-executable instructions to indicate that the electronic communication is

being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., page 4).

77. Referring to claim 29, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses computer-executable instructions to generate an alert if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the undesired behavior, said alert adapted to inform that the electronic communication relates to the undesired behavior to one or more of the following: the user or the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

78. Referring to claim 30, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein said alert is generated only if the electronic communication is still in progress (e.g., page 5).

79. Referring to claim 31, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the electronic communication comprises one or more electronic messages selected from a group comprising: an email, an instant messaging session, or a chat session (e.g., page 4).

80. Referring to claim 32, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein said computer is a server or a client (e.g., page 4).

81. Referring to claim 33, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein said computer is a client and said computer- executable instructions to analyze the electronic communication are located on a server, and wherein the server is adapted to receive the electronic communication sent or received by the client for said computer-executable instructions located on the server to analyze the electronic communication (e.g., page 4).

82. Referring to claim 34, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method to detect an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4), said method comprising: analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the unsafe behavior as a function of the analyzed features; generating a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said report indicative of the unsafe behavior; and sending the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., page 5).

83. Referring to claim 35, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses specifying a type of the unsafe behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4).

84. Referring to claim 36, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein said analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication comprises: parsing the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); generating, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the unsafe behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., page 4); and applying the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the unsafe behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication, wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the unsafe behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features, said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., page 4); and wherein said categorizing the electronic communication comprises categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., page 4).

85. Referring to claim 37, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein parsing the electronic communication comprises one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., page 5).

86. Referring to claim 38, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the method further comprises not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., page 4).

87. Referring to claim 39, Pather discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Pather also discloses wherein the method further comprises indicating that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., page 4).

88. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hegli et al., 6,606,659 (Hereinafter Hegli).

89. Referring to claim 1, Hegli discloses a method for detecting an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 4), comprising: analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 4); categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the unsafe behavior as a function of the analyzed features (e.g., col., 4); generating a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said report indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 6); and sending the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., col., 6).

90. Referring to claim 2, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses specifying a type of the unsafe behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 7).

91. Referring to claim 3, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein said type of the unsafe behavior includes one or more of the following: sexual predatory behavior, bullying behavior, offensive language, personal information solicitation or revelation, personal characteristics solicitation or revelation, meeting arrangement with a stranger, picture sharing with a stranger, or a combination thereof (e.g., col., 6).

92. Referring to claim 4, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication further comprises: parsing the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., col., 4); generating, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the unsafe behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., col., 6); and applying the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the unsafe behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication (e.g., col., 6), wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the unsafe behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features (e.g., col., 6), said rating indicating a probability that the electronic

communication relates to the type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 6); and wherein said categorizing the electronic communication comprises categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., col., 6).

93. Referring to claim 5, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior if the rating is greater than a threshold level (e.g., col., 7).

94. Referring to claim 6, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the probabilistic classifier comprises one or more classifiers selected from a group comprising: a Naive Bayesian classifier, a limited dependence Bayesian classifier, a Bayesian network classifier, a decision tree, a support vector machine, a content matching classifier, or a combination thereof (e.g., col., 8).

95. Referring to claim 7, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein parsing the electronic communication comprises one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., col., 4).

96. Referring to claim 8, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses updating one or more of the following: the probabilistic classifier or the predefined set of one or more features (e.g., col., 6).

97. Referring to claim 9, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the report is further sent to the user (e.g., col., 4).

98. Referring to claim 10, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., col., 6).

99. Referring to claim 11, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the report comprises one or more of the following: a content of the electronic communication, an identification of a source or recipient of the electronic communication, a time of the electronic communication, a type of the unsafe behavior related to the electronic communication, and a recommendation of how to address said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 6).

100. Referring to claim 12, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses indicating that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., col., 4).

101. Referring to claim 13, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses generating an alert if the electronic / communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said alert informing that the electronic communication relates to the unsafe behavior to one or more of the following: the user or the responsible person (e.g., col., 6).

102. Referring to claim 14, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein said alert is generated only if the electronic communication is still in progress (e.g., col., 7).

103. Referring to claim 15, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the electronic communication comprises one or more electronic messages selected from a group comprising: an email, an instant messaging session, or a chat session (e.g., col., 4).

104. Referring to claim 16, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses one or more computer readable media having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (e.g., col., 4).

105. Referring to claim 17, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses a system adapted to detect an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an undesired behavior (e.g., col., 4), comprising: a computer to receive or send the

electronic communication; computer-executable instructions to analyze one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the undesired behavior (e.g., col., 4); computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication as either relating to the undesired behavior or relating to an innocuous behavior as a function of the analyzed features (e.g., col., 4); computer-executable instructions to generate a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the undesired behavior, said report indicative of the undesired behavior; and computer-executable instructions to send the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., col., 6).

106. Referring to claim 18, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses computer-executable instructions to specify a type of the undesired behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the undesired behavior (e.g., col., 6).

107. Referring to claim 19, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein said type of the undesired behavior includes one or more of the following: sexual predatory behavior, bullying behavior, offensive language, personal information solicitation or revelation, personal characteristics solicitation or revelation, meeting arrangement with a stranger, picture sharing with a stranger, or a combination thereof (e.g., col., 6).

108. Referring to claim 20, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the computer-executable instructions to analyze one or more features of

the electronic communication further comprise computer-executable instructions to: parse the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., col., 4); generate, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the undesired behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., col., 4); and apply the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the undesired behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication (e.g., col., 6), wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the undesired behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features, said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the undesired behavior (e.g., col., 6); and wherein said computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication comprises computer-executable instructions to categorize the electronic communication as either relating to the type of the undesired behavior or relating to the innocuous behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., col., 7).

109. Referring to claim 21, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the type of the undesired behavior if the rating is greater than a threshold level (e.g., col., 7).

110. Referring to claim 22, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the probabilistic classifier comprises one or more classifiers selected from

a group comprising: a Naive Bayesian classifier, a limited dependence Bayesian classifier, a Bayesian network classifier, a decision tree, a support vector machine, a content matching classifier, or a combination thereof (e.g., col., 6).

111. Referring to claim 23, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the computer-executable instructions to parse the electronic communication comprise computer-executable instructions to perform one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., col., 7).

112. Referring to claim 24, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses computer-executable instructions to update one or more of the following: the probabilistic classifier or the predefined set of one or more features (e.g., col., 6).

113. Referring to claim 25, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the report is further sent to the user (e.g., col., 4).

114. Referring to claim 26, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses computer-executable instructions not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., col., 6).

115. Referring to claim 27, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the report comprises one or more of the following: a content of the electronic communication, an identification of a source or recipient of the electronic communication, a time of the electronic communication, a type of the undesired behavior related to the electronic communication, and a recommendation of how to address said type of the undesired behavior (e.g., col., 7).

116. Referring to claim 28, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses computer-executable instructions to indicate that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., col., 6).

117. Referring to claim 29, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses computer-executable instructions to generate an alert if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the undesired behavior, said alert adapted to inform that the electronic communication relates to the undesired behavior to one or more of the following: the user or the responsible person (e.g., col., 6).

118. Referring to claim 30, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein said alert is generated only if the electronic communication is still in progress (e.g., col., 7).

119. Referring to claim 31, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the electronic communication comprises one or more electronic messages selected from a group comprising: an email, an instant messaging session, or a chat session (e.g., col., 4).

120. Referring to claim 32, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein said computer is a server or a client (e.g., col., 4).

121. Referring to claim 33, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein said computer is a client and said computer- executable instructions to analyze the electronic communication are located on a server, and wherein the server is adapted to receive the electronic communication sent or received by the client for said computer- executable instructions located on the server to analyze the electronic communication (e.g., col., 6).

122. Referring to claim 34, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method to detect an electronic communication sent or received by a user and relating to an unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 6), said method comprising: analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication, said one or more features indicative of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 6); categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the unsafe

behavior as a function of the analyzed features; generating a report if the electronic communication is categorized as relating to the unsafe behavior, said report indicative of the unsafe behavior; and sending the report to a responsible person of the user (e.g., col., 7).

123. Referring to claim 35, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses specifying a type of the unsafe behavior to detect whether the electronic communication relates to said type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 6).

124. Referring to claim 36, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein said analyzing one or more features of the electronic communication comprises: parsing the electronic communication to generate a plurality of constituent tokens of the electronic communication (e.g., col., 4); generating, in response to said tokens, a feature vector associated with the electronic communication, said feature vector indicating whether each one of a predefined set of one or more features relating to the type of the unsafe behavior is present in the electronic communication (e.g., col., 6); and applying the generated feature vector to a probabilistic classifier relating to the type of the unsafe behavior to generate a rating for the electronic communication, wherein the probabilistic classifier trained on a content, anti-content, and close anti-content of the type of the unsafe behavior to identify said predefined set of one or more features, said rating indicating a probability that the electronic communication relates to the type of the unsafe behavior (e.g., col., 6); and wherein said categorizing the electronic communication comprises categorizing the electronic communication as relating to the type of the unsafe behavior as a function of the rating (e.g., col., 6).

125. Referring to claim 37, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein parsing the electronic communication comprises one or more of the following: parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain period of time, parsing the electronic communication with respect to a certain size window, or parsing the entire electronic communication (e.g., col., 7).

126. Referring to claim 38, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the method further comprises not to generate and send the report if an input indicating that a source or recipient of the electronic communication is trustworthy is received from the responsible person (e.g., col., 6).

127. Referring to claim 39, Hegli discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Hegli also discloses wherein the method further comprises indicating that the electronic communication is being analyzed to one or more of the following: a source or recipient of the electronic communication or the user (e.g., col., 4).

Conclusion

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the claims.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Haresh N. Patel/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154

3/3/08